

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

**I. Amendments to Claims**

Claim 1 has been amended to improve readability. In particular, the applicant wishes to emphasize that the switches are connected to both a signal line and a buffer unit, and that the scanning signal from the buffer unit controls supply of video signals to the display area. This was in the original claim but with a different syntax.

**II. Response to Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kabuto (5,151,689) is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Kabuto patent does not disclose or suggest switch units, controlled by an inverted scanning signal,

for supplying video signals to the active area of a flat panel display, *in which the switches are situated between video signal lines*, as recited in claim 1.

According to the Examiner, the claimed switch units correspond to switches 23 in Figs. 1 and 16. However, switches 23 of Kabuto are not controlled by an inverted scanning signal, and are not located between video signal lines. Instead, the video signal Vi of Kabuto is supplied through switches 23 via lines Dr1, Dr2, etc., which are scanned by signals S1, S2, etc. supplied by lines Ga1, Ga2, etc. Switches 23 serve to select the source of signals supplied to the video signal line *input* buffers 24, and not to control supply of video signals to the display area in response to scanning signals. As explained in col. 3, lines 52-57:

*The sampled image signals are outputted by the switch 23 to a signal line Dr1 through the buffer 24. . . Scanning lines Ga1 and Ga2 are selected in synchronism with the delivery of the image signals to the signal line Dr1. . .*

It is clear from this passage that switches 23 are located at the inputs of the video signal lines, and do not control supply of signals to the active area of the display in response to a scanning signal (whether inverted or not) buffer. Furthermore, it is

apparent from Figs. 1 and 16 of the Kabuto patent that the switches 23 are not located *between* any video signal lines.

The Kabuto patent does teach switches controlled by the scanning signal Ga1, Ga2, . . . to supply video signals from the video signal lines Dr1, Dr2, . . . to the active areas E11, E12, . . . of the display. However, the switches that carry out the claimed video supply in response to a scanning signal are switches M11, M12, . . . . Switches M11, M12, *etc.* are not situated between scanning lines, but rather are adjacent the active areas in the display matrix. This is because the Kabuto patent is directed to arranging the control switches in the display matrix so as to reduce the number of signal lines. The claimed invention, on the other hand, is concerned with the conventional type of display matrix having video signal scanning gates at the periphery of the display area, and in particular to the problem of parasitic capacitances resulting from crossing of the video signal lines and the scanning signal lines. The Kabuto patent does not consider the problem of scanning signal lines that cross multiple video signal lines, and in fact avoids the


problem by arranging the scanning control switches in the display area (at the cost of display area complexity).

Because the Kabuto patent fails to disclose or suggest switch units connected to both the video signal lines and scanning signal inverter buffers for controlling supply of video signals in response to the scanning signals, *the switch units being between the video signal lines*, it is respectfully submitted that the Kabuto patent does not anticipate the claimed invention and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 102(b) is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention is, for the reasons set forth above, not only novel but also non-obvious over the Kabuto patent, and therefore is in condition for allowance.

Having thus overcome the sole rejection made in the Official Action, withdrawal of the rejection and expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Appl. No. 10/692,741  
Reply to OA of December 8, 2006

Respectfully submitted,  
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

  
By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA  
Registration No. 33,805

Date: March 1, 2007

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC  
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500